LIBRARY COPY

THEOSOPHY

A MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF HUMANITY

THE STUDY OF OCCULT SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY, AND ARYAN LITERATURE

Vol. XLV—No. 8 **June, 1957**

BOTH belief and unbelief embrace but one small corner each of the infinite horizons of spiritual and physical manifestations; and thus both are right from their respective standpoints, and both are wrong in believing that they can circumscribe the whole within their own special and narrow barriers; for—they can never do so. In this respect Science, Theology, and even Spiritualism show little more wisdom than the ostrich does, when it hides its head in the sand at its feet.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

CONTENTS

READY FOR THEOSOPHY 337
TIME ENOUGH 339
FORCE OF PREJUDICE 340
CONFORMITY AND THOUGHTLESSNESS 348
NOTES ON THE DHAMMAPADA 349
REMNANTS OF THE SUB-RACES 353
SEEDS AND SEEDLINGS 359
YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK—AND ANSWER 362
THOUGHTS ON DREAMS 365
THE NEGLECTED "MYTH OF ER" 370
THE SOUL'S REACTIONS 374
ON THE LOOKOUT 375

$3.50 per Annum *35 Cents per Copy*

Edited and Published by

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles 7, California, U. S. A.

Publisher's Announcements

THEOSOPHY: Established November, 1912, by Robert Crosbie. Published monthly by The Theosophy Company, at Los Angeles, California, U. S. A. This Magazine is edited independently of any theosophical society or other organization. The Publishers assume full responsibility for all unsigned articles herein.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: No subscriptions are accepted for less than one year of 12 numbers, but subscriptions may begin with any desired number. All subscriptions, orders for single back numbers, and back volumes, bound or unbound, should be accompanied by the necessary remittance. Price $3.50 per annum; single numbers of the current volume, 35 cents each; back numbers, 50 cents each; back volumes, unbound, $5.00 each; for library style binding, prices on request. *Volumes I and XII are out of print.*

COMMUNICATIONS: Contributions submitted for publication should be typewritten double-spaced on one side of the paper only, with wide margins, and copies should be in all cases retained by the writers, as no manuscripts are returned.

CORRESPONDENCE: Letters from subscribers and readers are welcomed, with criticisms, comments or questions on any subject treated in the magazine. Questions on Theosophical Philosophy and History will be replied to direct, or, if of sufficient general interest, in the pages of the Magazine.

BEQUESTS AND DONATIONS: Gifts and legacies will be gladly received from those in sympathy with the objects of this Magazine when such benefactions are unencumbered and unrestricted. Donors should make their gifts to

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY, of Los Angeles, California, U. S. A., which is an incorporated association, legally empowered to receive such donations and bequests in furtherance of its objects. These objects are:

(*a*) To form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or color;

(*b*) The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study; and

(*c*) The investigation of the unexplained laws of Nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY
245 West 33rd Street
Los Angeles 7, California, U. S. A.

LIBRARY COPY

THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS
"Maitri-Bhavan"
15, Sir Krishna Rao Road,
BANGALORE-4, South India

A U M

Heaven's net is vast; though its meshes are wide, it lets nothing slip through.
—TAO TE KING

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLV June, 1957 No. 8

READY FOR THEOSOPHY

TO say that a man is not "ready" for Theosophy may easily constitute an inexcusable presumption, since who can tell, really, what is going on in the inward nature of another? Beneath the surface of exterior life, the processes of psycho-spiritual metabolism proceed at their own rate, often quite independent of the superficial aspect of human volition and decision. It may be true enough that an individual is often so completely engaged in a cycle of particular karmic involvement that he has no eyes or ears for anything beyond its periphery. In this sense he is not "ready," but care must be taken that notice of the fact goes no further than the conclusion that he is busy with matters *presently* absorbing his whole attention. That concentration, now, may be essential to a subsequent release of the mind and its attraction to the explicit principles and doctrines of the Theosophical philosophy. No one knows, when another's time comes, the extent to which that individual will then outrun many others, and especially those who allow complacency to color their appreciation of having found "the truth."

Who would have said, in 1850 or thereabouts, that the Western World was "ready" for Theosophy? There was even a reluctance, it is hinted, among the adepts, to launch an effort for which both indifference and ingratitude promised to be the principal response. Yet the effort was made, although at incredible cost to the chief founders of the Theosophical Movement. W.Q.J.'s "She Being Dead, yet Speaketh," is testament enough to what the world exacted of H.P.B. for daring to be the advocate of Theosophy.

What caused her to do it? She must have felt a deep affinity for the high dreams of the Renaissance, and a sense that the ideal of a civilized

and cosmopolitan Europe was not entirely a hopeless cause. She must have been able to foresee the titanic struggle in store for Americans, to break through the coarse rind of their materialism and acquisitiveness and to bring to birth a second installment of the American Dream. She must, in short, have loved the mankind of the West, suffered with its agonies, hoped with its hopes, and striven for its destiny. Even today, when Europe lies bleeding from the mutilations of two great wars, it is possible to feel the brooding genius of past greatness, in the arts, in literature, and in music, and to realize that, even in catastrophe, this greatness is not altogether gone, that the hearts of men still respond to the vision of a free life.

Who can tell when, in years to come, the weight of retributive Karma will fall away? Held between the upper and the nether mill-stone, the great mass of people have suffered for centuries. There has been failure and despair, but there has also been purgation and release.

The readiness of the West for Theosophy, today, is surely far greater than a century ago. And there is a profound difference, also, between the sort of interest that Theosophy may be able to excite, in years to come, and the almost superficial attention it won in the early days of the Society. Great layers of prejudice have been worn away during the years since then. Old faiths have been exhausted. Whole civilizations have suffered on the rack prepared for them by dread historical forces. The world, it might be said, has long been readying itself for a *living* philosophy, as distinguished from a dabbling with doctrine.

It is the larger historical perspective which should engage the hopes of the worker for Theosophy, these days. In scores of ways, the blindness of recent generations is being corrected. Men in every walk of life are lifting up their eyes and wondering what they ought to do next. This is an interlude between cycles—between the expiring breaths of an old order and the awakening of a new spirit. Some of this wondering is traceable to the slowly working leaven of Theosophical ideas. We cannot tell how much, nor need we, since the awakening itself is the great thing. For long centuries silent workers in the cause of human emancipation left their mark and sign in the minds and works of writers, poets, artists, and dreamers. The course of this inspiration winds through the history of Europe like a river of life, its continuity hidden, its source unknown. It is *all* the Theosophical Movement, if we choose to think so. What profit, then, can come from an account-

ing for credit, when, ultimately, it is the common human heart which has both the beneficence and the credit of such influences?

Labors for Theosophy are labors for a great convergence of all such efforts, to bring the spreading dawn of a new day for mankind. Inevitably, a time of open synthesis will arrive, bringing appropriate alliances and companionships suited to the objectives which are then required.

Meanwhile, the work for the present is as clear as the day when the *Key to Theosophy* was first published. It has not changed. The Theosophical Movement, proper, has its own work to do. It is a work of preparation, undertaken by those who are able to do it. The demands are not great. They call for study, for cooperation in developing a living vocabulary of conscious comprehension of the forces which operate in human life. That vocabulary will be needed some day. Others, moved by their Karma, by an intensity of resolve and inward inspiration, are doing other work, for which *they* are ready. It may be work which no one else can do. The final ordering of all these energies and relationships lies in other hands.

Time Enough

Love should make joy; but our benevolence is unhappy. Our Sunday-schools, and churches, and pauper-societies are yokes to the neck. We pain ourselves to please nobody. There are natural ways of arriving at the same ends at which these aim, but do not arrive. Why should all virtue work in one and the same way? Why should all give dollars? Farmers will give corn; poets will sing; women will sew; laborers will lend a hand; the children will bring flowers. And why this dead weight of a Sunday-school over the whole Christendom? It is natural and beautiful that childhood should inquire, and maturity should teach; but it is time enough to answer questions when they are asked.

—Emerson

FORCE OF PREJUDICE

The difference is as great between
The optics seeing, as the objects seen.
All manners take a tincture from our own,
Or some discolour'd through our passion shown;
Or fancy's beam enlarges, multiplies,
Contracts, inverts, and gives ten thousand dyes.
—POPE

IT is, indeed, shorter and easier to proceed from ignorance to knowledge than from error," says Jerdan.

But who in our age of religions gnashing their teeth at one another, of sects innumerable, of "isms" and "ists" performing a wild *fandango* on the top of each other's heads to the rhythmical accompaniment of tongues, instead of castanets, clappering invectives—who will confess to his error? Nevertheless, all cannot be true. Nor can it be made clear by any method of reasoning, why men should on the one hand hold so tenaciously to opinions which most of them have *adopted,* not *begotten,* while they feel so savagely inimical to other sets of opinions, generated by somebody else!

Of this truth the past history of Theosophy and the Theosophical Society is a striking illustration. It is not that men do not desire novelty, or that progress and growth of thought are not welcomed. Our age is as greedy to set up new idols as it is to overthrow the old gods; as ready to give lavish hospitality to new ideas, as to kick out most unceremoniously theories that now seem to them effete. These new ideas may be as stupid as green cucumbers in a hot milk soup, as unwelcome to the majority as a fly in communion wine. Suffice it, however, that they emanate from a scientific brain, a recognized "authority," for them to be welcomed with open arms by the fanatics of science. In this our century, as all know, every one in society, whether intellectual or scientific, dull or ignorant, is ceaselessly running after some new thing. More so even, in truth, than the Athenian of Paul's day. Unfortunately, the new crazes men run after, now as then, are not *truths*—much as modern Society prides itself on living in an age of facts—but simply corroborations of men's hobbies, whether religious or scientific. Facts, indeed, are eagerly sought after, by all—from the solemn conclaves of Science who seem to hang the destinies of the human race on the cor-

---

NOTE.—This article by H. P. Blavatsky first appeared in *Lucifer* for July, 1889, and was last reprinted in THEOSOPHY for August, 1941.

rect definition of the anatomy of a mosquito's *proboscis,* down to half-starved penny-a-liners on the war-path after sensational news. But, it is only *such* facts as serve to pander to one or another of the prejudices and preconceptions, which are the ruling forces in the modern mind that are sure of their welcome.

Anything outside of such facts; any new or old idea unpopular and distasteful, for some mysterious reason or other, to the prevailing *ism*-ical authorities, will very soon be made to feel its unpopularity. Regarded askance, at first, with uplifted eyebrows and in wonderment, it will begin by being solemnly and almost *à priori* tabooed and thence refused *per secula seculorum* even a dispassionate hearing. People will begin to comment upon it—each faction in the light of its own prejudice and special craze. Then, each will proceed to distort it—the mutually inimical factions even clubbing their inventions, so as to slay the intruder with the more certainty, until each and all will be running amuck at it.

Thus act all the religious *isms,* even so all the independent Societies, whether scientific, free-thinking, Agnostic or Secularistic. Not one of these has the faintest correct conception about Theosophy or the Society of this name; none of them has ever gone to the trouble of even enquiring about either—yet, one and all will sit in Solomon's seat and judge the hateful (perhaps, because dangerous?) intruder, in the light of their respective misconceptions. We are not likely to stop to argue Theosophy with religious fanatics. Such remarks are beneath contempt, as those in "Word and Work" which, speaking of "the prevalence of Spiritualism and its advance *under the new form of Theosophy*" (?), strikes both with a sledge-hammer tempered in holy water, by first accusing both Spiritualism and Theosophy of "imposture," and then of *having the devil.**—But when in addition to sectarian fanatics, missionaries and foggy retrogrades, in general, we find such clear-headed, cool, intellectual giants as Mr. Bradlaugh falling into the common errors and prejudice—the thing becomes more serious.

It is *so serious,* indeed, that we do not hesitate to enter a respectful yet firm protest in the pages of our *journal*—the only organ that is

* "Many, however," it adds, "who have had fuller knowledge of spiritualistic pretensions than we have, are convinced that, in some cases, there are real communications from the spirit world. If such there be, we have no doubt whence they come. They are certainly from beneath, not from above." *O Sancta Simplicitas,* which still believes in the *devil*— by perceiving its own face in the mirror, no doubt?

likely to publish all that we have to say. The task is an easy one. Mr. Bradlaugh has just published his views upon Theosophy in half a column of his *National Reformer* (June 30th) in which article—"Some Words of Explanation"—we find some half-a-dozen of the most regrettable misconceptions about the supposed beliefs of Theosophists. We publish it *in extenso* as it speaks for itself and shows the reason of his displeasure. Passages that we mean to controvert are underlined.

SOME WORDS OF EXPLANATION

The review of Madame Blavatsky's book in the last *National Reformer* and an announcement in the *Sun* have brought me several letters on the subject of Theosophy. I am asked for explanations as to what Theosophy is, and as to my opinions on Theosophy. The word "theosoph" is old, and was used among the Neoplatonists. From the dictionary, its new meaning appears to be, "one who claims to have *a knowledge of God,* or of the laws of nature by means of internal illumination." An Atheist certainly cannot be a Theosophist. A Deist might be a Theosophist. *A Monist could not be a Theosophist. Theosophy must at least involve Dualism.* Modern Theosophy, according to Madame Blavatsky, as set out in last week's issue, asserts much that I do not believe, and alleges some things which to me are certainly not true. I have not had the opportunity of reading Madame Blavatsky's two volumes, but I have read during the past ten years many publications from the pen of herself, Colonel Olcott, and other Theosophists. They appear to me to have sought to *rehabilitate a kind of Spiritualism in Eastern phraseology.* I think many of their allegations utterly erroneous, and their reasonings wholly unsound. I very deeply indeed regret that my colleague and co-worker has, with somewhat of suddenness, and without any interchange of ideas with myself, adopted as facts, matters which seem to me *as unreal as it is possible for any fiction to be.* My regret is greater as I know Mrs. Besant's devotion to any course she believes to be true. I know that she will always be earnest in the advocacy of any views she undertakes to defend, and I look to possible developments of her Theosophic opinions with the very gravest misgiving. The editorial policy of this paper is unchanged, and is directly antagonistic to all forms of Theosophy. I would have preferred on this subject to have held my peace, for the publicly disagreeing with Mrs. Besant on her adoption of Socialism has caused pain to both; but on reading her article and taking the public announcement made of her having joined the Theosophical organization, I owe it to those who look to me for guidance to say this with clearness.

—C. BRADLAUGH.

It is of course useless to go out of our way to try and convert Mr. Bradlaugh from his views as a thorough Materialist and Atheist to our Pantheism (for real Theosophy *is that*), nor have we ever sought by word or deed to convert Mrs. Besant. She has joined us entirely of her own free will and accord, though the fact gave all *earnest* Theosophists unbounded satisfaction, and to us personally more pleasure than we have felt for a long time. But we will simply appeal to Mr. Bradlaugh's well-known sense of justice and fairness, and prove to him that he is mistaken—at any rate, as to the views of Colonel Olcott and the present writer, and also in the interpretation he gives to the term "Theosophy."

It will be sufficient to say that if Mr. Bradlaugh knew anything of the *Rules* of our Society he would know that if even he, the Head of Secularism, were to become today a member of the Theosophical Society, such an action would *not necessitate his giving up one iota of his Secularistic ideas.* We have greater atheists in the T. S. than he ever was or can be, namely, Hindus belonging to certain all-denying sects. Mr. Bradlaugh believes in mesmerism, at all events he has great curative powers himself, and therefore could not well deny the presence in some persons of such mysterious faculties; whereas, if you attempted to speak of mesmerism or even of hypnotism to the said Hindus, they would only shrug their shoulders at you, and laugh. Membership in the Theosophical Society does not expose the "Fellows" to any interference with their religious, irreligious, political, philosophical or scientific views. The Society is not a sectarian nor is it a religious body, but simply a nucleus of men devoted to the search after truth, whencesoever it may come. Mrs. Annie Besant was right when stating, in the same issue of the *National Reformer,* that the three objects of the Theosophical Society are:

> To found a Universal Brotherhood without distinction of race or creed; to forward the study of Aryan literature and philosophy; to investigate unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man. On matters of religious opinion, the members are absolutely free. The founders of the society deny a personal God, and a somewhat subtle form of Pantheism is taught as the Theosophic view of the Universe, though even this is not forced on members of the Society.

To this Mrs. Besant adds, over her own signature, that though she cannot, in the *National Reformer,* state fully her reasons for joining the T. S., yet she has

> no desire to hide the fact that this form of Pantheism appears to promise solution of some problems, especially problems in psychology, which Atheism leaves untouched.

We seriously hope that she will not be disappointed.

The second object of the T. S., *i.e.,* the Eastern philosophy interpreted esoterically, has never yet failed to solve many a problem for those who study the subject seriously. It is only those others, who, without being natural mystics, rush heedlessly into the mysteries of the unexplained psychic powers latent in every man (*in Mr. Bradlaugh himself,* as well as in any other) from ambition, curiosity or simple vanity—that generally come to grief and make the T.S. responsible for their own failure.

Now what is there that could prevent even Mr. Bradlaugh from joining the T. S.? We will take up the argument point by point.

Is it because Mr. Bradlaugh is an Individualist, an English Radical of the old school, that he cannot sympathize with such a lofty idea as the Universal Brotherhood of Man? His well-known kindness of heart, his proven philanthropy, his life-long efforts in the cause of the suffering and the oppressed, would seem to prove the contrary in his practice, whatever his theoretical views on the subject may be. But, if perchance he clings to his theories in the face of his practice, then let us leave aside this, the first object of the T. S. Some members of our Society, unfortunately, sympathize as little as he might with this noble, but perchance (to Mr. Bradlaugh) somewhat Utopian ideal. No member is obliged to feel in *full* sympathy with all three objects; suffice that he should be in sympathy with one of the three, and be willing not to oppose the two others, to render him eligible to membership in the T. S.

Is it because he is an Atheist? To begin with, we dispute "the new meaning" he quotes from the dictionary that "a Theosophist is one who claims to have a knowledge of God." No one can claim *a knowledge* of "God," the absolute and unknowable universal Principle; and in a personal god Eastern Theosophists (therefore Olcott and Blavatsky) do *not* believe. But if Mr. Bradlaugh contends that in that case the name is a misnomer, we shall reply: *theosophia* properly means *not* a knowledge of "God" but of gods, *i.e., divine,* that is superhuman knowledge. Surely Mr. Bradlaugh will not assert that human knowledge exhausts the universe and that no wisdom is possible outside the consciousness of man?

And why cannot a *Monist* be a Theosophist? And why must Theosophy at least involve *dualism?* Theosophy teaches a far stricter and more far-reaching *Monism* than does Secularism. The Monism of the latter may be described as materialistic and summed up in the words, "Blind Force and Blind Matter ultimating in Thought." But this—begging Mr. Bradlaugh's pardon—is *bastard* Monism. The Monism of Theosophy is truly philosophical. We conceive of the universe as one in essence and origin. And though we speak of Spirit and Matter as its two poles, yet we state emphatically that they can only be considered as distinct from the standpoint of human, *mayavic* (*i.e.,* illusionary) consciousness.

We therefore conceive of spirit and matter *as one in essence* and not as separate and distinct antitheses.

What then are the "matters" that seem to Mr. Bradlaugh "as *unreal* as it is possible for any fiction to be"? We hope he is not referring to those physical phenomena, which most unfortunately have been confused in the Western mind with philosophical Theosophy? Real as these manifestations are—inasmuch as they were *not* produced by "conjuring tricks" of any kind—still the best of them are, ever were and ever will be, no better than *psychological illusions,* as the writer herself always called them to the disgust of many of her phenomenally inclined friends. These "unrealities" were all very well as *toys,* during the infancy of Theosophy; but we can assure Mr. Bradlaugh that all his Secularists might join the T. S. without ever being expected to believe in them—even though he himself produces the same "unreal" but *beneficent* "illusions" in his mesmeric cures, of many of which we heard long ago. And surely the editor of the *National Reformer* will not call "unreal" the ethical and ennobling aspects of Theosophy, the undeniable effects of which are so apparent among the bulk of Theosophists—notwithstanding a back-biting and quarrelling minority? Surely again he will not deny the elevating and strengthening influence of such beliefs as those in Reincarnation and Karma, doctrines which solve undeniably many a social problem that seeks elsewhere in vain for a solution?

The Secularists are fond of speaking of Science as "the Saviour of Man," and should, therefore, be ready to welcome new facts and listen to new theories. But are they prepared to listen to theories and accept facts that come to them from races which, in their insular pride, they term effete? For not only do the latter lack the sanction

of orthodox Western Science, but they are stated in an unfamiliar form and are supported by reasoning not cast in the mould of the inductive system, which has usurped a spurious place in the eyes of Western thinkers.

The Secularists, if they wish to remain consistent materialists, will have perforce to shut out more than half the universe from the range of their explanations: that part namely, which includes mental phenomena, especially those of a comparatively rare and exceptional nature. Or do they imagine, perhaps, that in psychology—the youngest of the Sciences—everything is already known? Witness the Psychic Research Society with its Cambridge luminaries—sorry descendants of Henry More!—how vain and frantic its efforts, efforts that have so far resulted only in making confusion worse confounded. And why? Because they have foolishly endeavoured to test and to explain psychic phenomena on a physical basis. No Western psychologist has, so far, been able to give any adequate explanation even of the simplest phenomenon of consciousness—sense perception.

The phenomena of thought-transference, hypnotism, suggestion, and many other mental and psychic manifestations, formerly regarded as supernatural or the work of the devil, are now recognized as purely natural phenomena. And yet it is in truth the same powers, only intensified tenfold, that are those "unrealities" Mr. Bradlaugh speaks about. Manipulated by those who have inherited the tradition of thousands of years of study and observation of such forces, their laws and modes of operations—what wonder that they should result in effects, unknown to science, but *supernatural* only in the eyes of ignorance.

Eastern Mystics and Theosophists do *not* believe *in miracles* any more than do the Secularists; what then is there *superstitious* in such studies?

Why should discoveries so arrived at, and laws formulated in accordance with strict and cautious investigation be regarded as "rehabilitated Spiritualism"?

It is a historically recognized fact that Europe owes the revival of its civilization and culture, after the destruction of the Roman Empire, to Eastern influence. The Arabs in Spain and the Greeks of Constantinople brought with them only that which they had acquired from nations lying still further Eastward. Even the glories of the classical age owed their beginnings to the germs received by the Greeks

from Egypt and Phœnicia. The far remote, so-called antediluvian, ancestors of Egypt and those of the Brahmin Aryans sprang once upon a time from the same stock. However much scientific opinions may vary as to the genealogical and ethnological sequence of events, yet the fact remains undeniable that every germ of civilization which the West has cultivated and developed has been received from the East. Why then should the English Secularists and Freethinkers in general, who certainly do not pride themselves on their imaginary descent from the lost ten tribes, why should they be so reluctant to accept the possibility of further enlightenment coming to them from that East, which was the cradle of their race? And why should they, who above all, ought to be free from prejudice, fanaticism, and narrow-mindedness, the exclusive prerogatives of *religious* bodies, why, we ask, should they who lay claim to free thought, and have suffered so much themselves from fanatical persecution, why, in the name of wonder, should they so readily allow themselves to be blinded by the very prejudices which they condemn?

This and many other similar instances bring out with the utmost clearness the right of the Theosophical Society to fair and impartial hearing; as also the fact that of all the now existing "isms" and "ists," our organization *is the only body entirely and absolutely free from all intolerance, dogmatism, and prejudice.*

The Theosophical Society, indeed as a body, is the *only* one which opens its arms *to all,* imposing on none its own special beliefs, strictly limited to the small *inner* group within it, called the Esoteric Section. It is truly *Universal* in spirit and constitution. It recognizes and fosters no exclusiveness, no preconceptions. In the T. S. alone do men meet in the common search for truth, on a platform from which all dogmatism, all sectarianism, all mutual party hatred and condemnation are excluded; for, accepting every grain of truth, wherever it is found, it waits in patience till the chaff that accompanies it falls off by itself. It recognizes and knows of, and therefore avoids its representatives in its ranks—but one enemy—an enemy common to all, namely, Roman Catholicism, and that only because of its auricular confession. But even this exception exists only so far as regards *its inner group,* for reasons too apparent to need explanation.

Theosophy is monistic through and through. It seeks the one Truth in all religions, in all science, in all experience, as in every system of thought. What aim can be nobler, more universal, more all-embracing?

But evidently the world has not yet learned to regard Theosophy in this light, and the necessity of disabusing at least some of the best minds in the English-speaking countries, of the prejudices springing from the tares sown in them by our unscrupulous enemies is felt more than ever at this juncture. It is with the hope of weeding these minds from all such misconceptions, and of making the position of Theosophy plainer and clearer, that the present writer has prepared a small volume, "The Key to Theosophy," now in the press, and to be published very shortly. Therein are gathered in the shape of dialogue all the principal errors about, and objections to, Theosophy and its teachings, and more detailed and fuller arguments in proof of the assertions made in this article will be found in that work. The writer will make it her duty to send an early copy—not to the editor of the *National Reformer*—but to Mr. Bradlaugh *personally.* Knowing him by reputation for long years, it is impossible for us to believe that our critic would ever condescend to follow the example of most of the editors, lay or clerical, and condemn a work *on faith* even before he had cut open its pages, merely because of the unpopularity of its author and the subject treated.

In that volume it will be found that the chief concern of Theosophists is *Search after Truth,* and the investigation of such problems in Nature and Man which are mysteries today, but may become secrets, open to science, tomorrow. Is this a course which Mr. Bradlaugh would oppose? Does *his* judgment belong to the category of those that can never be open to revision? "This shall be your creed and belief, and therefore, all investigation is useless," is a *dictum* of the Roman Catholic Church. It cannot be that of the Secularists—if they would remain true to their colours.

CONFORMITY AND THOUGHTLESSNESS

Breadth of spirit, the delight of insight, and the full and free luxuriant flowering of thought—these are the qualities which, like wine, must mellow for decades in dark, cool, undisturbed cellars. It would indeed be ironic if the securing of the greatest material freedom should produce also a tendency toward conformity, and mitigate against individuality and spiritual development.

—LIN YUTANG

NOTES ON THE DHAMMAPADA

AS has been pointed out earlier in this series, the usual arrangement of verses and chapters in Buddha's *Dhammapada* is a matter of tradition. However, sequences apparent through many of the chapters and verses suggest that a logical unfolding of Buddha's teaching has been clear to the disciples who undertook to record the Word of the Law.

The whole of the *Dhammapada,* of course, is a dissertation on karma, but is not primarily a doctrinal assertion. Buddha begins with the thought dynamics through which men *create* karmic destiny. The goal for each Disciple of the Law is not to attain some particular end or state of existence, but to learn how to take up the burden of his own personality where he finds it; not to become a Buddha through initiation or even emulation, but to let the spirit and motivation of a Buddha—a spirit which lives secretly in the mind and heart of each human being—establish its kinship with all who are laboring to make the same ethical ascent. Buddha recognized, perhaps more clearly than any other great religious teacher, that each man must "climb the mountain" in his own way, and in his own time. Each plateau of enlightenment is reached only after the expenditure of "dauntless energy," and this "dauntless energy" must be regarded as a first requisite, since the mountain always stretches beyond sight into the clouds above, with each terrace providing no more than a further point of orientation for an extension of the climb.

It is indeed difficult, therefore, to attempt to "synthesize" the perspective of Gotama. His was a universal vision, comprising every form of striving and knowledge of every form of self-deceit; thus the "compassion" of The Enlightened One was the stronger for the absence of any sentimentality. Professor Edwin A. Burtt, in concluding his volume *The Teachings of The Compassionate Buddha,* endeavors to convey the mood of Gotama in an unsigned Epilogue, titled "Buddha's Pity." The following verses provide a suggestive setting for the direct instruction of the verses of the *Dhammapada*:

> My children,
> The Enlightened One, because He saw Mankind drowning in the
> Great Sea of Birth,
> Death and Sorrow, and longed to save them,
> For this He was moved to pity.

Because He saw the men of the world straying in false paths, and none to guide them,
For this He was moved to pity.
Because He saw that though they longed for happiness, they made for themselves no karma of happiness; and though they hated pain, yet willingly made for themselves a karma of pain,
For this He was moved to pity.
Because He saw them consumed by the fires of pain and sorrow, yet knowing not where to seek the still waters of samadhi,
For this He was moved to pity.
Because He saw them living in an evil time, subjected to tyrannous kings and suffering many ills, yet heedlessly following after pleasure,
For this He was moved to pity.
Because He saw them living in a time of wars, killing and wounding one another; and knew that for the riotous hatred that had flourished in their hearts they were doomed to pay an endless retribution,
For this He was moved to pity.
Because many born at the time of His incarnation had heard Him preach the Holy Law, yet could not receive it,
For this He was moved to pity.
Because some had great riches that they could not bear to give away,
For this He was moved to pity.
Because He saw the men of the world ploughing their fields, sowing the seed, trafficking, huckstering, buying and selling; and at the end winning nothing but bitterness,
For this He was moved to pity.

The last three Chapters of the *Dhammapada,* titled respectively, "Craving," "The Bhikkhu," and "The Brahamana," are indicative of the sense of psychological order which prevails throughout. Discussions of the dangers of uncontrolled desires and of the steps which must be taken to gain their mastery are not negative commandments, but signposts on the road to attainment. Those who are "slaves to their desires" may yet, at any time, discover "the gift of the Law" which, as Buddha said, "excels all gifts." "The flavour of the Law," he continues, "excels all flavours. Delight in the Law excels all delights." The Bhikkhu is one who *begins* to realize that Life and Law are indistinguishable. However long a journey he may still need to travel in partial ignorance, he has learned at least enough to become a man of meditation, and it is only through meditation that he ensures that an attempted climb up the towering mountain is truly an ascent.

For meditation, clearly, is something no man can accomplish for another:

> Meditate, O Bhikkhu; do not be heedless. Let not your mind whirl around the pleasures of the senses.
>
> Without insight there is no meditation and also without meditation there is no insight.
>
> What time, with perfect recollection, he recognizes the rise and fall of *skandhas* (origin and destruction of the personal self) joy and happiness are his. This is life eternal.

In the process of attaining the capacity to meditate consistently, Buddha speaks of the necessity for cutting off five afflictions, which are described in these terms:

> (1) Delusion of personality; (2) Doubt, *i.e.*, "sceptical doubt—the not wishing to understand"; (3) False Asceticism and "clinging to mere rules and ritual"; (4) Yearning for desire fulfilment; and (5) Ill-will.

These afflictions, however, are balanced by an equally innate "Five sources of strength"—which are to be cultivated:

> (1) Faith; (2) Attention; (3) Dauntless Energy; (4) Meditation; and (5) Wisdom.

From this one is able to see that Buddha's intention is to encourage psychological understanding by breaking down the usual generalities of religious warnings—focussing on contemplation of those specifics of psychology which allow an intellectual grasp of both the positive and negative aspects of the human situation. Thus, the "true Brahamana" is able to live in peace and harmony, not only with his equals, but also in the presence of fools, "friendly among the hostile, mild among the violent, ungrasping among the greedy." And as a Protestant and a reformer—or perhaps we might say, a "radical"—Buddha is insistent, in this his last chapter, that no one should feel that "the Brahamana caste" can be obtained by outward compliance to rule, training, or by heredity.

Fortune's favored soldiers cannot forcefully invite others to share the plane of mind on which they live. They can provide no precise instructions, nor guarantee any success. The chief corruptions of Buddhism have occurred among those for whom this point has been obscured, who have confused membership in a monastic order with enlightenment, and who have mistakenly thought that *inner* security may be obtained by joining with those who determinedly practice ritual. Those who read the verses of the *Dhammapada* in search of enlighten-

ment rather than solace see how insistently Gotama stresses the need for self-reliance and ethical independence. Again and again, he also remarks that the capacity to be content with a solitary life is but a preliminary step towards the attainment of the Nirmanakaya vesture. The disciple is counseled to be neither social nor anti-social, but to rise above those levels of perception where the "social" is the only means for expressing interdependence. The Nirmanakaya, above all beings, *enjoys* the fact of interdependence with all beings, and because he so enjoys, he no longer thinks or speaks in terms of "society" at all. Yet, despite this, he leaves behind him an atmosphere which conveys something of value to others who still need to band together for assurance.

Gradually, it appears, this interpretation of Buddha's basic intent is becoming more clearly represented in Western psychological literature. An earlier view, as nearly everyone knows, was that Buddhism was a "negation." It is now more easily seen how Buddha's teaching can provide the *affirmative state of mind,* upon which the highest and most desirable social foundations can be built. Edmund Taylor, in his *Richer by Asia,* finally discovered, as have many others, a means of linking the meditative life of Buddha to the sort of goals which we of the West hold desirable. Contrasting "Eastern and Western religious attitudes," Mr. Taylor arrived at a conclusion which both surprised and intrigued him:

> The holy man of the West, I reflected, leads a socially useful existence in striving for a seemingly asocial goal. The holy man of the East seems completely asocial both in practice and in theory, yet in reality he is not. The successful Eastern mystic—the one who feels that he is making substantial progress toward his goal—usually follows the example of the Buddha, who, after years of solitary introspection, attained enlightenment, then devoted the rest of his life to intense social, cultural, and psychiatric labors. The enlightened Eastern mystic may or may not engage in good works in the Christian sense, but his instruction of his disciples constitutes in itself a valid social activity, however asocial its content may seem to be.

And so the teaching of the Buddha is, in the last analysis, a Secret Doctrine. It provides the means by which a man may draw into focus the energies of his soul aspiration; and therefore, more than any other world teachings, Buddhism works for the good of the world; even the most corrupted sort of doctrinal Buddhism has yet tended away from fratricide and ill-will.

REMNANTS OF THE SUB-RACES

SINCE Vaivasvata Manu's Humanity appeared on this Earth, there have already been four axial disturbances. The old continents—save the first one—were sucked in by the oceans, other lands appeared, huge mountain chains arose where there had been none before. The face of the Globe was completely changed each time. The survival of the fittest nations and races was secured through timely help; and the unfit ones—the failures—were disposed of by being swept off the earth. Such sorting and shifting does not happen between sunset and sunrise, as one may think, but requires several thousands of years before the new house is in order. The Sub-races are subject to the cleansing process, as also the side-branchlets (the family races).

We are told that it is after the destruction of "Lemuria" by subterranean fires that men went on steadily decreasing in stature—a process already commenced after their *physical* Fall; and that finally, some millions of years after, they reached between six and seven feet, and are now dwindling (as the older Asiatic races) to nearer five than six feet. As Pickering shows, there is in the Malay race (a sub-race of the fourth root-race) a singular diversity of stature. The members of the Polynesian family (Tahitians, Samoans, and Tonga islanders) are of a higher stature than the rest of mankind; but the Indian tribes and the inhabitants of the Indo-Chinese countries are decidedly below the general average. This is easily explained. The Polynesians belong to the very earliest stock of the surviving sub-races, the others to the very last and transitory stock. The Tasmanians are now completely extinct, and the Australians are rapidly dying out. So will the other old races soon follow.

The light yellow is the color of the first *Solid* human race, which appeared after the middle of the third root-race (after its fall into generation) bringing on the final changes. This race gave birth to the fourth race; "Siva" gradually transforming that portion of Humanity which became "black with sin" into *red-yellow* (the red Indians and the Mongolians being the descendants of these) and finally into brown-white races—which now, together with the yellow

---

NOTE.—Collated from *The Secret Doctrine*.

races, form the great bulk of Humanity. The majority of mankind belongs to the seventh sub-race of the fourth root-race . . . [inland] Chinamen and their off-shoots and branchlets (Malayans, Mongolians, Tibetans, Hungarians, Finns, and even the Esquimaux are all remnants of this last offshoot). The present yellow races are the descendants however of the early branches of the fourth race. Of the third race, the *only* pure and direct descendants are a portion of the fallen and degenerated Australians, whose far distant ancestors belonged to a division of the seventh sub-race of the third. The rest are of mixed Lemuro-Atlantean descent. They have since then entirely changed in stature and intellectual capacities.

Mankind is obviously divided into the god-informed and the lower human creatures. The intellectual difference between the Aryan and other civilized nations and such savages as the South Sea Islanders, is inexplicable on any other grounds. No amount of culture, nor generations of training and civilization could raise such human specimens as the Bushmen, the Veddhas of Ceylon, and some African tribes, to the same intellectual level as the Aryans, the Semites, and the Turanians so called. The "sacred spark" is missing in them, and it is just they who are the only *inferior* races on the globe, now happily fast dying out. Verily mankind is "of one blood," *but not of the same essence.* We are the hot-house, artificially quickened plants in nature, having in us a spark, which in them is latent. The phrase used in the *Stanzas,* "They were not ready," signifies that the *Karmic* development of these Monads had not yet fitted them to occupy the forms of men destined for incarnation in higher intellectual races.

Those races which "remained destitute of knowledge," or those again which were left mindless, remained as they were, even after the natural separation of the sexes. It is these who committed the first cross-breeding, so to speak, and bred monsters. And it is from the descendants of these that the Atlanteans chose their wives. Of such semi-animal creatures, the sole remnants known to Ethnology were the Tasmanians, a *portion* of the Australians, and a mountain tribe in China, the men and women of which are entirely covered with hair. They were the last descendants in a *direct* line of the semi-animal latter-day Lemurians referred to. There are, however, considerable numbers of the mixed Lemuro-Atlantean peoples produced by various crossings with such semi-human stocks—e.g., the wild men of Borneo, the Veddhas of Ceylon, most of the remaining Australians, Bushmen, Negri-

tos, Andaman Islanders, etc. The Australians of the Gulf of St. Vincent and the neighborhood of Adelaide are *very hairy,* and brown down on the skin of boys of five or six years of age assumes a furry appearance. They are, however, degraded *men*—not the closest approximation to the "*pithecoid* man," as Haeckel so sweepingly affirms. Only a portion of these men are a Lemurian relic.

The survivors of the later Lemurians, who escaped the destruction of their fellows when the main continent was submerged, became ancestors of a portion of the present native tribes. Being of a very low sub-race, begotten originally of animals, of monsters, whose very fossils are now resting miles under the sea floors, their stock has since existed in an environment strongly subjected to the Law of Retardation. In these red-haired and hair-covered monsters, the fruit of the unnatural connection between men and animals, the "Lords of Wisdom" did not incarnate. Thus by a long series of transformations due to unnatural cross-breeding (unnatural "sexual-selection"), originated in due course of time the lowest specimens of humanity; while further bestiality and the fruit of their first animal efforts of reproduction begat a species which developed into mammalian apes later. There are naturalists who have sincerely considered the problem whether some savage tribes, like the Bushmen for instance, can be regarded as *men* at all. The Commentary says, in describing that species (or race) of animals "fair to look at" as a biped: "*Having human shape, but having the lower extremities, from the waist down, covered with hair.*" Hence the race of the satyrs, perhaps.

The Malays and Papuans (of New Guinea) are a mixed stock, resulting from the intermarriages of the low Atlantean sub-race with the Seventh sub-race of the third root-race. Like the Hottentots, they are of indirect Lemuro-Atlantean descent. It is a most suggestive fact —to those concrete thinkers who demand a *physical* proof of Karma —that the lowest races of men are now rapidly dying out; a phenomenon largely due to an extraordinary sterility setting in among the women, from the time that they were first approached by the Europeans. A process of decimation is taking place all over the globe, among those races whose "time is up"—among just those stocks, be it remembered, which esoteric philosophy regards as the senile *representatives of lost archaic nations.* It is inaccurate to maintain that the extinction of a lower race is *invariably* due to cruelties or abuses perpetrated by colonists.

. . . Further, is not the phenomenon here confirmed of the operation of CYCLIC LAW difficult to account for on materialistic lines? Whence the "destined cycle" and the order here testified? Why does this (Karmic) sterility attack and root out certain races at their "appointed hour"? The answer that it is due to a "mental disproportion" between the colonizing and aboriginal races is obviously evasive, since it does not explain the sudden "checks to fertility" which so frequently supervene. The dying out of the Hawaiians, for instance, is one of the most mysterious problems of the day. Ethnology will sooner or later have to recognize with Occultists that the true solution has to be sought for in a comprehension of the workings of Karma. As Lefevre remarks, "the time is drawing near when there will remain nothing but three great human types" (before the sixth root-race dawns), the white (Aryan, fifth root-race), the yellow, and the African negro—with their crossings (Atlanto-European divisions). Redskins, Eskimos, Papuans, Australians, Polynesians, etc., etc.,—all are dying out. Those who realize that every root-race runs through a gamut of seven sub-races with seven branchlets, etc., will understand the "why." The tide-wave of incarnating egos has rolled past them to harvest experience in more developed and less senile stocks; and their extinction is hence a Karmic necessity.

The human is the only species which, however unequal in its race, can breed together. "There is no question of selection between *human races,*" say the anti-Darwinists, and no evolutionist can deny the argument—one which very triumphantly proves *specific* unity. How then can Occultists insist that a portion of the *fourth* race humanity begot young ones from females of another, only *semi-human,* if not quite an animal race, the hybrids resulting from which union not only bred freely but produced the ancestors of the modern anthropoid apes? Esoteric science replies to this that it was in the very beginning of physical man. Since then, Nature has changed her ways, and sterility is the only result of the crime of man's bestiality. But we have to this day proofs of this. *The Secret Doctrine* teaches that the specific unity of mankind is not without exceptions even now. For there are, rather still were a few years ago, descendants of these half-animal tribes or races, both of remote Lemurian and Lemuro-Atlantean origin. Tasmanians (now extinct), Australians, Andaman Islanders. The descent of the Tasmanians can be almost proved by a fact, which struck Darwin a good deal, without his being able to make anything of it. This fact

deserved notice.

Now de Quatrefages and other naturalists, who seek to prove Monogenesis by the very fact of every race of mankind being capable of crossing with every other, have left out of their calculations exceptions, which do not in this case confirm the rule. Human crossing may have been a general rule from the time of the separation of the sexes, and yet that other law may assert itself, viz., sterility between two human races, just as between two animal species of various kinds, in those rare cases when a European, condescending to see in a female of a savage tribe a mate, happens to choose a member of such mixed tribes. "Crossing," as it is called, of Europeans with Tasmanian women—i.e., the representatives of a race, whose progenitors were a "soulless" and mindless monster and a real human, though still a mindless man—brought on sterility. This, not alone as a consequence of a physiological law, but also as a decree of *Karmic* evolution in the question of further survival of the abnormal race. In no one point of the above is Science prepared to believe as yet—but it will have to in the long run. Esoteric philosophy, let us remember, only *fills in the gaps* made by science and corrects her false premises. Thus, in calling the animal soulless, it is not depriving the beast, from the humblest to the highest species, of a "soul," but only of a conscious surviving *Ego-soul, i.e.,* that principle which survives after the man, and reincarnates in a like man. The animal has an astral body, that survives the physical form for a short period; but its (animal) Monad does not reincarnate in the same, but in a higher species, and has no "Devachan" of course. It has the *seeds* of all the human principles in itself, but they are *latent.*

The theory which would judge of the intellectual capacity of a man according to his cranial capacity, seems absurdly illogical to one who has studied the subject. The skulls of the stone period, as well as those of African races (Bushmen included) show that the first are above rather than below the average of the brain capacity of the modern man, and the skulls of the last are on the whole (as in the case of Papuans and Polynesians generally) larger by one cubic inch than that of the average Frenchman. On comparing the results obtained by Dr. J. Bernard Davis, the Craniologist, worked out in 1868, with regard to the internal capacity of the skull—its volume being taken as the standard and test for judging of the intellectual capacities—Dr. Pfaff finds that this capacity among the French (certainly in the highest rank of mankind) is 88.4 cubic inches, being thus "perceptibly

smaller than that of the Polynesians generally, which, even among many Papuans and Alfuras of the lowest grade, amounts to 89 and 89.7 cubic inches"; which shows that it is the *quality* and not the *quantity* of the brain that is the cause of intellectual capacity. And figures in relation to the size of the respective brain of man and ape show how deep is the gulf that separates the two. Vogt says that the brain of the largest ape, the gorilla, measures no more than 30.51 cubic inches; while the average brains of the flat-headed Australian natives—the lowest now in the human races—amount to 99.35 cubic inches! Figures are awkward witnesses and can not lie.

Even in the coming Seventh Race, at the close of this fourth Round, while our four lower principles will be fully developed, that of *Manas* will be only proportionately so. This limitation, however, refers solely to the spiritual development. The intellectual, on the physical plane, was reached during the fourth root-race. Thus, those who were "half-ready," who received "but a spark," constitute the average humanity which has to acquire its intellectuality during the present Manvantaric evolution after which they will be ready in the next for the full reception of the "Sons of Wisdom." While those which "were not ready" at all, the latest Monads, which had hardly evolved from their latest transitional and lower animal forms at the close of the third Round, remained the "narrow-brained" of the *Stanzas of Dzyan.*

This explains the otherwise unaccountable degrees of intellectuality among the various races of men—the savage Bushman and the European—even now. Those tribes of savages, whose reasoning powers are very little above the level of the animals, are not the unjustly disinherited, or the *unfavored,* as some may think—nothing of the kind. They are simply those *latest* arrivals among the human Monads, which *were not ready*: which have to evolve during the present Round, as on the three remaining globes (hence on four different planes of being) so as to arrive at the level of the average class when they reach the Fifth *Round.* One remark may prove useful, as food for thought to the student in this connection. The MONADS of the lowest specimens of humanity (the "narrow-brained" savage South Sea Islanders, the African, the Australian) had no Karma to work out when first born as men, as their more favoured brethren in intelligence had. The former are spinning out Karma only now; the latter are burdened with past, present, and future Karma. In this respect the poor savage is more fortunate than the greatest genius of *civilised countries.*

SEEDS AND SEEDLINGS

Occultism—True and False

[The short articles comprising this series are derived from characteristic talks given during the years 1915-35. As often as practicable, the words of the speaker have been used without change, in the hope of conveying some of the force originally imparted to the ideas.]

OCCULTISM is the knowledge of the mysteries; and the mysteries of nature are manifold. Each man is not only a mystery to himself, but he also confronts mysteries on every hand. These mysteries, man is incessantly trying to solve by indirect means —through the senses, by inferences, by deductions made from the testimony of the senses, and by speculations that he postulates.

Let us postulate three categories of nature: objective nature, subjective nature, and the unknown "something" in which both reside. That is, physical nature, psychic nature, and Spiritual or metaphysical nature. It is the mysteries of these three "natures" that man attempts to solve—usually by recourse to one of the four specialized approaches toward an understanding of nature: science, logic, religion, or philosophy.

The basis of exact science is an attempt to explore and to understand the riddle of the universe by an empirical, or phenomenal, study of objective nature. If we consider, we will find it a very curious thing that the moment a man becomes a student of objective nature, he comes bolt upright against invisible nature, which cuts across his field of vision. This intangible, invisible, unknown something which brings to man the things that he studies, holds them under his eyes for a time, and then takes them away from him, is called by scientists "force" or "energy," indifferently. So, immediately, the objective universe places a man in a mysterious contact with a non-objective universe; yet the scientist knows that there is an immediate relation between the world that he calls "force" and the world that he calls "matter." Man's knowledge of force is where it transects matter—comes into conflict, so to say, with matter.

Learning that force does come into what we may call opposition with matter, scientists have tabulated and classified the forms of interference in the same way that they have classified the forms of matter. So they speak of mechanical energy, chemical energy, electrical energy,

vital energy. They might just as well say Tweedledum, Tweedledee, and Timbuctoo: they are only giving *names,* and explaining nothing.

Yet there *is* a connection between force and matter—of this the scientist is assured. This third element of the physical trinity the scientist calls "law"; and he comes into contact with it in a much more real sense than any Christian divine ever came into contact with any member of the theological trinity. Just as we know matter only by its interference with us, and know force only by its interference with matter, so we know law only by *its* interference with force and matter. So far, the scientist is an occultist; but one who falls short, and must forever fall short, of complete knowledge—like a man endeavoring to solve a problem of four unknown quantities with three equations.

What we will call "logic" is not either formal, syllogistic logic nor the logic defined in dictionaries, but is, rather, that invisible power, principle, function, or process, by which we are able to determine a relation between two occurrences, calling one "cause," the other "effect"—no matter to what we may apply our logic. The scientist uses this sort of logic in setting up his hypothesis, which he then *tests.* So that what the scientist *knows,* is true—that is, the facts he establishes are "real" facts.

The theologian, on the other hand, has no such excellent occult discipline, no such rigid regimen, no such sureties from which to proceed as has the scientist. The theologian perceives, logically, that all that *is,* in any event, is but an effect: that the event is not self-originating, not self-sustaining, not self-destroying. He therefore "knows" that there must be *something* which stands in some kind of efficient relation to the cosmos, to the phenomena of the cosmos, and to man. In this, the theologian is wiser than the scientist. But the religionist is right *only* in the perception that until the subjective universe becomes as cognizable, as exactly charted, as the objective universe, the scientist can never arrive at *real* knowledge—which is what Occultism is. (Yet the scientist at least realizes, as the religionist does not, that that only is knowledge to any man which he has verified *for himself.*)

Philosophy is a consideration of the principles of everything; its tool, speculative logic. Science traces phenomenal causes; religion dreams of ultimate Cause; philosophy speculates on causation. Thus, our science is practical, our religion is dream-stuff extruded into the waking consciousness, our philosophy is speculation. All these approaches to the study of the nature of things depend upon the medium

of the five senses and inferences from *perceived* phenomena. If there is an underlying reality, you could never *know* that it exists, even if you did "guess" it by these methods. *This* knowledge, then, is false, or limited, occultism.

Man has a physical body here; he has an astral body on another plane of nature; he has a mind on a still different plane of nature; a psychic form, you might call it, on *its* plane of nature. But the man, *himself,* dwells in none of these bodies nor on any of these planes. He dwells on the plane of the changeless, the eternal—free from birth, free from death, free from sorrow, free from every tendency, because he recognizes the identity of the "real being" everywhere, in everything. He has then a flawless knowledge of Universal Brotherhood from within, from the Spiritual standpoint, the inclusive standpoint. He is concerned with souls, not bodies; with truth, not dogmas; with practice, not profession. But above all he is interested in that kind of practical expression of fraternity which works for the emancipation of the soul in the only way that any soul ever can be emancipated—through knowledge: through that knowledge of God, that knowledge of nature, that knowledge of the soul which is inherent in every man by virtue of the fact that he is Spirit.

There is, therefore, no more noble, no more worthy, no more wonderful thing than for a man, charts in hand, comrades on the voyage ranged alongside him, to begin to explore the penetralia of his own nature. Veil after veil will lift, and with each lifting of the veil his horizon grows wider and wider; but still there will be veil upon veil behind. And the danger for him, the neophyte in occultism, is that when he has penetrated but one step beyond the mundane, has lifted but one of the veils, he shall think that he knows it all. The progress of the Ego is a series of progressive awakenings, in each of which he thinks: "Now, at last, I have reached reality." Yet not until he has united his consciousness with the one eternal Self, is he free from that dream called Maya, manifested existence.

All these things *can* be known by a man, of and for himself; for true Occultism is self-knowledge, self-discipline, self-control, self-mastery.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK—AND ANSWER

IT is not too uncommon to find among those who profess attachment to the essentials of Christian theology—original sin, supernatural God, etc.—those who are well-educated in modern psychology. One wonders how such a person brings those two worlds of thinking together.

(*a*) Nineteenth- and twentieth-century psychology has cast grave doubts on the underlying assumption of this question—the assumption that a man should always be held accountable as a logical person desiring to reconcile his worlds of thinking so that he may pursue a "consistent" way in life. How much of our own selves are we aware of on an overt level? Think back over the years, and attempt to recall all our responses, attitudes, and feelings, and those interacting with us, which form the conceptions we have of that entity called "I." We can see quite clearly that the paths we follow are rarely, if ever, more than approximately consistent.

However, the assumption that man does not usually reconcile his "worlds" still leaves the question of how these attractions came about, as well as why they continue. But whether it be a mathematical fact, a subjective feeling, a thought-process of communication—either within the individual or through contact with another—it must be extended from the realm of the known to the unknown for any understanding and growth to take place. To the Theosophist, obviously, these attractions are but outgrowths from previous attachments in either this or a past life.

Looking at the problem of "perfect blending" from another point of view, one might say that the only individuals in whom inconsistencies are not present are either adepts or idiots; between these extremes is striving man with his hopes and aspirations, his goodness and acts of altruism, as well as his tendencies toward personal gratification, his desire to be told what to do, and to be absolved of responsibility. It is a fortunate thing, then, that men abound in "inconsistencies" of this nature, because they goad toward a further probing for truth.

(*b*) In a sense, it is quite easy to see how a devotee of Christian theology could be in harmony with any sort of psychology which "expects the worst" from "animal" nature. If one starts with the premise

that a human being is essentially "bad," bound to be engrossed in sinful or selfish thoughts and habits, he will hardly blame anyone else for not acting like a God. The most modern of "modern psychology" emphasizes the fact that in order for a person to realize what it is that motivates him, what hidden thoughts and tendencies make up his "being" at the present time, he must accept the fact that man is in fact dual in nature. That is, that the unconstructive, the unloving, the selfish side of human nature must be faced openly before it can be understood; and only understanding can channel energy in better directions. On the side of tolerance for inconsistencies, child psychology, especially, stresses dealing with a child *where he is,* rather than where one would *like* him to be. The ignoring or fearful suppressing of unpleasant attitudes or actions does not nurture understanding.

Literal Christianity obviously emphasizes the unconstructive side of man; the more "popular" psychology starts with the premise that man is originally sinful, that he can never, no matter what he does, thinks, or chooses, eliminate this tendency of self-interest—that it can never be overcome, only subdued or smoothed over. Man can, and does, have higher aspirations, higher thoughts and tendencies, sometimes to an impressive extent. But these are automatically discounted if the entire approach is negative rather than positive. There is not so much struggle, less heart-breaking tendency to expect the best of human beings if one believes that man is inherently evil or egocentric—that life is a matter of trying to be "good" in *spite* of his sinful nature, rather than the natural evolution or unfoldment, of the higher nature of man. This, for both academic psychology and orthodox religion, is a far cry from saying that ultimately, no matter how weak man is and appears, he is responsible for himself and his environment.

Another way one might "reconcile" these two worlds might be to feel that there is that portion of man's life which should not be, and is not, rational, not subject to logical reasoning, but rather outside the realm of man's present ability to reason about it. This approach leaves one in the position of denying nothing basically, yet accepting tolerantly all the contradictions concerning man's nature and destiny.

However, upon closer examination of Christianity and psychology, one can see the incompatibility of the two. Christianity, as far as the mass is concerned, is a negative approach to life, expecting the worst first, last, and always, from *individual men,* rather than looking for the best. Psychology admits that "the worst" is there, and quite active

too, but basically psychology is optimistic. This "worst" referred to can be overcome if one truly desires to take himself in hand; potentially he is capable of guiding his life and its complexities. It is just that in order to be in the position of guiding, all factors of the situation —namely, the human nature—must be understood; nothing should be overlooked or ignored even if it is unpleasant and makes life appear more complicated. The latest psychology denies nothing ultimately, but Christianity often *does* deny man the inherent ability to be more than a creature of weakness, and a not very good one at that.

It has been said that one should not copy any certain person or his actions; "be yourself" and don't try to imitate anybody. But what if some habits or actions of another appeal to one in the sense of setting, so to say, a good example? Should one completely ignore those actions and continue "being oneself"?

In the first place, one cannot completely ignore "those actions" or any others. The psychic nature is receptive, and finds it very difficult to ignore either attraction or repulsion. Then too, no one can be really and completely *only* himself. We live constantly with, and are influenced by, other people and situations. And every part of our nature save the highest is a mixture of many things that have impressed us at different times of our lives—ideas that we have heard and have gravitated toward. So there is very little which really shows to the public what is truly "one's self." Even most of our so-called crucial decisions are very much colored by association with things heard, seen, felt, through or with other persons; for this sort of "borrowing" is done constantly without our conscious choice.

This is simply a fact of human nature, and cannot be said to be bad or good. But we should *try* to know when we are leaning in this or that direction, or when we are influenced by an attraction, regardless what level of our being it appeals to; we should try not to let ourselves be "sponges," absorbing everything that comes along.

But if someone's habits or actions seem to express something worthwhile to us, let us try to discover what it is we really are admiring the most. Obviously, if it is the surface personality which intrigues us, that is hardly worth adopting, since we have all too few "different" people today—most are imitators. If enough thought is paid to the attitude under question, and not to the outward habit or action, perhaps enough of our "self" may be retained while we are learning.

THOUGHTS ON DREAMS

THE teaching of Theosophy on dreams—a teaching which centers around the Immortal Ego—has its vital, intimate, and practical bearing on human evolution in general, and on the upward progress of aspirants on the Path more particularly.

The outstanding treatise on dreams is that of H. P. Blavatsky in the *Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge.* It is significant that this treatise, in question-and-answer form, "became incorporated in a regular series of instructions"—as the introductory note states. Was this preliminary discussion on dreams an accident, or was it by design and in accordance with the fitness of things? It was undoubtedly the latter, for it draws our attention to the part played by the well-nigh omniscient Ego during sleep and the enlightening influence of the Ego on its mortal instrument when the personal man turns towards his divine Prototype.

The stanzas on which *The Secret Doctrine* is based are fragments taken from a heretofore secret and sacred record of immemorial lineage known as the *Book of Dzyan.* The abstruse and highly metaphysical character of these stanzas, even as translated in modified form, are evident to all who pursue them; yet it could not be otherwise, "for in the world mental or in the world spiritual each man must progress by his own efforts." Even H.P.B.'s copious answers to the searching questions of the highly intelligent students of the Blavatsky Lodge, while explaining much, could not remove metaphysical difficulties, which can only be resolved by each one for himself. Many who have studied H.P.B.'s explanations have been impressed with the fact that the answers are almost as abstruse and difficult to comprehend as the stanzas themselves. Higher Manas, to which alone this primeval record reveals its meaning, is an integral ray of and one with Mahat, or Universal Intelligence and Consciousness, and its knowledge and comprehension are immeasurably higher than that of the brain-mind or Lower Manas. As expressed on page 74 of *Transactions*: "But the universal consciousness of the real Ego transcends a millionfold the self-consciousness of the personal or false Ego."

It is safe to conclude that the consciousness and thought of the Real Man, the Imperishable Triad, Atma-Buddhi-Manas, is occupied with the royal knowledge of the *Book of Dzyan,* as that knowledge is that of the Soul's own long evolutionary pilgrimage and ultimate goal.

When the lower mind—the incarnated ray—turns towards and wrestles with these selfsame stanzas, it is natural for the Higher Mind, in deep sleep, to be magnetically drawn to its own lower ray and to seek to enlighten and aid it in every way. If the Higher Ego in *Sushupti* or dreamless sleep enfolds even wayward personalities in its protective sphere —for, as William Q. Judge wrote, "Even criminals," in *Sushupti,* "commune through the higher nature with spiritual beings and enter into the spiritual plane"—how much more would this be true of personal Egos who have chosen to give themselves unreservedly to the same great goal as that of the Reincarnating Individuality? It was very probably for this reason that H.P.B. thought it well to follow the study of the abstruse stanzas from the *Book of Dzyan* by an exposition of the occult teaching on dreams.

That to understand and work constructively with the states of consciousness experienced during sleep formed part of the training of disciples in all ages may be deduced from Mr. Judge's words in his article, "The Three Planes of Human Life." He wrote: "Among those steps [to final attainment] are an acquaintance with and understanding of the three states first spoken of." His concluding sentences are:

> The subject is one of enormous extent as well as great importance, and theosophists are urged to purify, elevate, and concentrate the thoughts and acts of their waking hours so that they shall not continually and aimlessly, night after night and day succeeding day, go into and return from these natural and wisely appointed states, no wiser, no better able to help their fellow men. For by this way, as by the spider's small thread, we may gain the free space of spiritual life.

And in *The Voice of the Silence,* which consists of fragments chosen from a book as old as the *Book of Dzyan* itself (since the *Book of the Golden Precepts* "formed part of the same series as that from which the Stanzas of the *Book of Dzyan* were taken"). There is a reference to three states which lead to the fourth, named in a note as "*Jagrat,* the waking; *Svapna,* the dreaming; and *Sushupti,* the deep sleeping state." These states are called "three Yogi conditions," pointing to the fact that Yogis or disciples had to acquaint themselves with and win final mastery over all three. Such mastery would lead to the fourth, or the *Turiya* state, "that beyond the dreamless state, the one above all, a state of high spiritual consciousness." In the *Turiya* state, the thread of individual consciousness remains unbroken, and H.P.B. defines immor-

tality as "one's unbroken consciousness" (*Key,* 108). A statement in the *Glossary* under "Turiya Avastha" (*Avastha* is Sanskrit for state) appears to confirm the meaning of "one's unbroken consciousness." It is: "A condition of the higher Triad, quite distinct (though still inseparable) from *Jagrat* (waking), *Svapna* (dreaming), and *Sushupti* (sleeping)." What can this mean except that the Adept, the Master, the Yogi (and only such can experience *Turiya*) "each lives in more than three states while incarnated upon this world, *and they are fully conscious of them all* (italics ours), while the ordinary man is only conscious of the first—the waking life, as the word conscious is now understood." ("The Three Planes of Human Life.") In other words, in *Turiya,* the Adept is fully conscious of Jagrat, Svapna, and Sushupti, and can witness and evaluate them without the least self-identification with these states. In terms of the *Glossary,* the higher Triad is quite distinct from the states of waking, dreaming, and sleeping, yet inseparable from them. An Adept is fully conscious in all states, at all times, and under all circumstances.

Although real dreams, as distinguished from idle visions due to *kamic* and purely physiological disturbances, have their source in the life, the thoughts, and the experiences of the *inner* immortal Man, they are not the essences of these thoughts and experiences. Only in rare cases, such as prophetic dreams, is there a clear transmission to the lower consciousness of a message from the Higher Self. This message is "generally plain and clear; either a voice heard or the coming event foreseen." The vast majority of dreams are more or less transformed or distorted transmissions to the lower Self of the ideations and actions of the Higher Ego.

One of the causes of this distortion is the fact that in our present state of evolution, the ideation of Higher Manas does not reach the *personal* mind directly, but through the Astral Light. As stated by H.P.B. on page 66 of the *Transactions*: "Were the Personalities (Lower Manas or the *physical* minds) to be inspired and illumined solely by their higher *alter Egos* there would be little sin in the world. But they are not; and getting entangled in the meshes of the Astral Light, they separate themselves more and more from their parent Egos." Further elements that make for distortion of the instructions of the Higher Ego are mentioned by H.P.B. in answer to, "What is it that dreams then?":

> Generally the physical brain of the personal Ego, the seat of memory, radiating and throwing off sparks like the dying embers of a fire. The memory of the Sleeper is like an Æolian seven-stringed harp; and his state of mind may be compared to the wind that sweeps over the chords. The corresponding string of the harp will respond to that one of the seven states of mental activity in which the sleeper was before falling asleep. If it is a gentle breeze the harp will be affected but little; if a hurricane, the vibrations will be proportionately powerful. If the personal Ego is in touch with its higher principles and the veils of the higher planes are drawn aside, all is well; if on the contrary it is of a materialistic animal nature, there will be probably no dreams; or if the memory by chance catch the breath of a "wind" from a higher plane, seeing that it will be impressed through the sensory ganglia of the cerebellum, and not by the direct agency of the spiritual Ego, it will receive pictures and sounds so distorted and inharmonious that even a Devachanic vision would appear a nightmare or grotesque caricature. Therefore, there is no simple answer to the question "What is it that dreams?" for it depends entirely on each individual what principle will be the chief motor in dreams, and whether they will be remembered or forgotten.

The *Turiya* condition can never be attained unless and until all factors that make for distortion in the process of descent from the spiritual to the terrestrial planes, from Higher Manas to its lower ray in the body, are overcome, and the Higher Impersonal and the lower personal function in unison. In the words of William Q. Judge: "This consummation, so devoutly desired, cannot be secured unless at some period in his evolution the being takes the steps that lead to the final attainment," and, as already stated, among these steps are an acquaintance with the understanding of the three planes of human life common to all men, and recognition of the prime importance of the waking state in its bearing on the other two. "Jagrata, our waking state, is the one in which we must be regenerated; where we must come to a full consciousness of the Self within, for in no other is salvation possible."

To be regenerated is to be born again, the second birth being of the Spirit. It consists in the awakening of the true Self or Higher Consciousness in mortal man. The full birth or incarnation of the Higher Principles is the work of many lives, and in most cases, what seems an interminable number of earthly existences. The number of incarnations depends on the man himself, on the self-induced and self-devised efforts put forth, for in the human stage the evolution of each and every Soul is in its own hands. While mortal man during all this time has, at best, only a partial realization of the Self, the EGO, on the other hand, has

a complete knowledge of its earthly existences. In sleep it is fully aware of the condition of its lower aspect and instrument, and seeks to help, enlighten, and protect it in every way possible. In other words, while the lower is only dimly conscious of the Higher, the Higher is always fully conscious of the lower. This is graphically illustrated in the following question and answered on page 75 of *Transactions*:

> Q. What is the cause of that experience in dreams in which the dreamer seems to be ever striving after something, but never attaining it?
>
> A. It is because the physical self and its memory are shut out of the possibility of knowing what the real Ego does. The dreamer only catches glimpses of the doings of the Ego, whose actions produce the so-called dream on the physical man, but is unable to follow it consecutively. A delirious patient, on recovery, bears the same relation to the nurse who watched and tended him in his illness as the physical man to his real Ego. The Ego acts as consciously within and without him as the nurse acts in tending and watching over the sick man. But neither the patient after leaving his sick bed, nor the dreamer on awaking, will be able to remember anything except in snatches and glimpses.

The struggle between the two "selves" in man forms the drama of human and of all evolution; and in this struggle the Higher is always fully aware of the successes, the failures, and the fluctuations of the lower, the warning voice of conscience being the Soul's projection in us during the waking state of its awareness and overshadowing presence. During sleep, by the very fact that the lower is asleep and passive, the abyss between the Higher and the lower is far more marked. As expressed on page 61 of the *Transactions*: "During the waking hours the thoughts and Voice of the Higher Ego do or do not reach his gaoler —the physical man, for they are the *Voice of his Conscience,* but during his sleep they are absolutely the 'Voice in the desert'." The extent to which the Higher Ego can enlighten and guard the physical man during sleep is determined by the heed given the warning voice of conscience while awake.

(*To be concluded*)

THE NEGLECTED "MYTH OF ER"

PLATO'S "Myth of Er," occurring at the close of the *Republic's* tenth book, deals directly with the philosophy of reincarnation, and is therefore a key to theosophic study of Platonism. Very often Western scholars have failed to recognize that Plato gave allegiance to the philosophy of rebirth—even missing it in the Myth of Er. But with some understanding of this myth as a background, the Theosophist discovers implications of reincarnation in one form or another in almost all of Plato's dialogues. In other words, what is quite apparent to one familiar with Eastern philosophy or with Theosophical writings is not so apparent to those who have been steeped in a different tradition.

Plato was a Greek, and thought as the Greeks thought—on a plane whereon rebirth seemed a natural and inevitable sequence to death. Yet in comparing the Greek temperament and poet to the temperament and the approach which we associate with Eastern scriptures, we encounter a marked difference. Edith Hamilton, who is regarded by many as the clearest exponent of the constituents of the Greek mind, so celebrated in all cultural history, has remarked that the Greeks were "the first intellectuals." Now by intellectuals, Miss Hamilton means nothing derogatory; rather, she means that the Greeks had a passion for reasoning about things. The blind acceptance of a belief was not natural to them. It was the quest, the search, the pondering of questions, the free and fertile use of the imagination, which occupied the Greek's attention. This was the theme of Greek culture at its peak, and as an interesting consequence there was no sharp division between religion, politics, philosophy, and the arts. The arts were not something to appeal only to the emotions—they also were to have a rational basis for existence. If a Greek could not *understand* a work of art, he was not interested in it; everything must be susceptible to reason. We might imagine, then, if we consider the æons of what the theosophical student calls Theosophical History, that here a new tone was struck. We find in Plato the remains of an ancient Wisdom-Religion—no longer presented as doctrines, but instead as *ideas*. In modern parlance, borrowed from scientific language, this means the language of hypothesis. This is the way Plato spoke.

Madame Blavatsky described Plato as an initiate. In the tradition of Western Theosophy, this implies that the teacher, instead of disseminating doctrine, spoke to the awakening fire of creative mind, stirring it to reach forward to a new epoch wherein self-reliance was to be the keynote, rather than reliance upon trusted authority. As William Q. Judge said, a new hour has struck, and it is no longer possible for people to fulfill themselves by following tradition alone. The ancient Greeks are honored today, throughout the world, because of their new approach in philosophy and religion. It is perhaps for this reason that Plato has been paid homage, even by many who do not understand the many esoteric or hidden meanings in his writings.

Plato's use of myth and allegory is directly in line with his esoteric intent. He blends philosophy and art, because this is the way in which he can arouse creative imagination in those who listen to what he has to say. All the Platonic dialogues are dramas; they are dramas because, with Socrates as the key figure, we see ourselves in a situation we can all understand and sympathize with. The fact that he uses Socrates to speak his philosophy is also important, because Socrates held to the essential beliefs of ancient mystic religion. Socrates too, was a "reincarnationist," and this is clearly established in the history of philosophy.

Turning, then, directly to the myth of Er itself, we may note with a little amusement that this discourse on reincarnation and Karma has been eliminated from a number of texts of the *Republic* as being so confusing that it is presumably not worthy of study—somehow not "truly representative" of Plato. This seems an incredible conclusion, especially for those who profess that the *Phædo is* representative. For in the *Phædo* we find another symbolic description of the life of the soul as it passes from state to state. The Myth of Er is simply more nearly all-encompassing.

Er is a hero; he is an adventurer; he is killed in battle. Plato also says that Er is not an ordinary sort of hero, but a special sort; he has an unusual destiny which does not interrupt continuity of consciousness. Er was "slain" in battle, yet his body was found ten days afterward, unaffected by decay. On the twelfth day, as he was lying on the funeral pyre, he returned to life and told those around him the story of his adventures in the other world as a free soul—thus revealing some of the mysteries of a life after death.

Er was "chosen," especially favored; so that we find here some sort of an analogy with Arjuna, "fortune's favored." Er meets companions

in the "other world" who tell him that he is to be a messenger to carry the report of this other world to living men. So they invite him to come near and see all that can be seen or heard in the after-death state. On one side are the souls departing at the openings of heaven and earth. "When sentence had been passed on them," other souls arrived, some ascending out of the earth, "dusty and worn with travel," some descending out of heaven, "clean and bright." This, of course, is a reference, not only to reincarnation, but to those after-death states described in detail in Theosophical literature; the rest for the soul between death and another birth is both a time for refreshment and a time where the tangled energies of the personality are sorted out, leaving the mind free again to think in terms of soul. When we are enmeshed in our unfulfilled desires, we *cannot* think as souls.

There are, then, *two* "purgatories," one pleasant and one unpleasant. The soul must pass through both before it can become "clean and bright." Now, when Er looks around him, he sees that there are "souls" of diverse sorts. This is not the picture of the Christian heaven, where, presumably, all souls exist in the same condition, raised to that state by the power of God. We recognize instead the maintaining of individuality—different tastes, different reactions, different desires. The crux of the myth is the doctrine of Karma as the natural law of inner equilibrium. When Er and the spirits arrive, they must go at once to Lachesis, who represents the past. "First of all there came a prophet who arranged them in order; then he took from the knees of Lachesis lots and samples of lives, and having mounted a high pulpit spoke as follows: 'Hear the word of Lachesis, the daughter of Necessity. Mortal souls, behold a new cycle of life and mortality. Your genius will not be alloted to you, but you will choose your genius; and let him who draws the first lot have the first choice, and the life which he chooses shall be his destiny. Virtue is free, and as a man honours or dishonours her he will have more or less of her; the responsibility is with the chooser'."

Now comes the distribution of lots. There were lives of all kinds—the lives of the tyrants, the lives of the famous men, those who were known for grace of form and beauty, those who would be in the new life renowned for their strength and success in games, and some who were the reverse of famous. The tragedy here is that the souls, given freedom to choose, are not really free: "Most curious," says Er, "was the spectacle—sad and laughable and strange; for the choice of the

souls was in most cases based on their experience of a previous life"—on the basis of the inadequacies and predilections stamped upon the character. Those who were to be born again thus came into the same sort of an environment as the one they had quitted.

Here is a solution of the problems of "fate and free will." Necessity compels the soul to encounter again the experiences of life. Habit then usually causes men to choose the same circumstances they had known before—the "sad and laughable" part of the reincarnation cycle. Again, we find clear exposition of Theosophic doctrine. Only those who have freed themselves from bondage to the disruptions of anger and the attractions of desire were able to pass *consciously* through the states after death.

Before the new birth, all souls drink of the waters of Lethe—that is, of "forgetfulness"—a river symbolized under different names in many scriptures. Lethe represents not only the necessary forgetfulness that comes when a soul is through with the old life and ready for a new birth on earth, but also symbolizes release from any psychological involvement.

There are three rivers running through the land described by Er—rivers which may be described as "streams of consciousness." When we exist on one plane, we are confined in that stream of consciousness. Man finally learns to sustain himself in a different element. So forgetfulness, or "dying" out of one state, is part of initiation. Every progressive awakening means a psychological death. The same symbolism applies to souls who are to be projected into birth again. So, in the end, they are suddenly, as in a cataclysm, "driven upward," as Plato puts it. This is the hour when the processes of nature again take over. When the soul is ready, the cosmos is ready for the soul; it will be caught up in the needed experiences of the new life.

The central meaning of the Myth of Er is the story of a hero who is different from most conventional heroes—different because he becomes *conscious* of his transitions between the "places" represented by death and life. He also, therefore, represents one who has already been through various forms of initiation. Plato, then, in this myth, may be thought to describe the whole psychological meaning of mystic religion—progressive initiation on the part of those who have become heroic in their determination to strive for the truth, and who persevere in the elimination of unworthy tendencies in their own nature—those which the honest and valiant man will seek out. At the end, therefore,

we see that Plato is not simply telling a story; he is preparing those who listen to what he says for the broadest of all visions of human destiny:

> Let each one of us leave every other kind of knowledge and seek and follow one thing only, if peradventure he may be able to learn and may find some one who will make him able to learn and discern between good and evil, and so to choose always and everywhere the better life as he has opportunity. He should know what the effect of beauty is when combined with poverty or wealth in a particular soul, and what are the good and evil consequences of noble and humble birth, of private and public station, of strength and weakness, of cleverness and dullness, and all the natural and acquired gifts of the soul. He will then look at the nature of the soul, and from the consideration of all these qualities he will be able to determine which is the better and which is the worse; and so he will choose. All else he will disregard. A man must take with him into the world below an adamantine faith in truth and right, that there too he may be undazzled by the desire of wealth or the other allurements of evil, lest, coming upon tyrannies and similar villainies, he do irremediable wrongs to others and suffer yet worse himself; but let him know how to choose the mean and avoid the extremes on either side, as far as possible, not only in this life but in all that which is to come. For this is the way of happiness.

THE SOUL'S REACTIONS

Let us ask what is the function of the external world for the stream of experience which constitutes the soul. This world, thus experienced, is the basic fact within those experiences. All the emotions, and purposes, and enjoyments, proper to the individual existence of the soul are nothing other than the soul's reactions to this experienced world.

—ALFRED NORTH WHITEHEAD

ON THE LOOKOUT

A Shocking Situation

"I've had enough. I'll never go to Sunday school again. It's the most wasted hour in the week."

This statement (made by a serious, intelligent, teen-age youth), says Wesley Shrader (*Life,* Feb. 11), and the subsequent "failure to win Tom back to religious activities forced me, as a Protestant minister, to become better acquainted with my own Sunday school as well as with a host of other Protestant Sunday schools in various parts of the nation." Mr. Shrader's investigation revealed that—

> Although there have been great changes for the better in the past 10 years, the U.S. Protestant Sunday school is often nothing more than a glorified baby-sitting service, or a place where children listen to grotesque stories and memorize verses, or a Sunday morning social hour characterized by a considerable amount of horseplay.

Strange Ways and Means

Mr. Shrader discovered that a large enrollment did not necessarily mean that the class was of high quality. Instead, he found that irreverence, rowdyism, and impudence were the order of the day in many Sunday school classes. Even where there was a semblance of order, it was often maintained on the class-members' terms. For example:

> One teacher of 15-year-old girls solves the problem of indifference by letting the girls use the class period to discuss dates, fashions and dances. An older man meets the discipline problem by encouraging his teen-age students to discuss baseball, football and basketball. . . . In one Sunday school lay leaders permit the boys and girls to sing hymns in rock-and-roll rhythm. . . .
>
> I recently had a chance to discuss Sunday schools with a group of college students who came from all parts of the country. They convinced me that Sunday schools as a whole are not better than ever.

According to Mr. Shrader, churchmen all over the country are bestirring themselves to remedy these conditions. Several Protestant ministers have collaborated in drawing up a series of suggestions which, so far, seem merely palliative: strengthening the curriculum by making it planned rather than haphazard, getting trained profes-

sional leaders to help with the teaching, training lay teachers within the framework of the local church, and making the home a part of the Sunday school by planning a curriculum for parents.

YOUTH AWARENESS

Another instance of youth's lack of easy acceptance of religion is shown by a *Mirror-News* (Los Angeles) report of a panel discussion of "an act to provide in the public schools a course in basic concepts of world religions." This, of course, is not a real bill, but is one to be considered at the Committee on Education at the YMCA's ninth annual Model Legislatures in Sacramento. The *Mirror-News* (Feb. 19) explains:

> Actually, the State Educational Code now prohibits teaching "of any sectarian or denominational doctrine" in the public schools. So the subject of religion in the public schools has always been a hotly controversial issue.

The panel agreed that "greater understanding of other people's religious beliefs is desirable because knowledge reduces prejudice and conflicts born of prejudice," but disputed that the "best way to develop this understanding would be a course on world religions in public high schools."

The consensus of opinion seemed to be that, although the over-all objective is commendable, since many students would be unable to take advantage of college courses in comparative religion, the introduction of this subject at the high school level is premature. The feeling that students in general are still too biased to attain the necessary detachment for a consideration of this subject, and the difficulty of assuring unbiased teaching on the subject of religion worked against wholehearted support of the "bill." This, despite the proponent's vehement assertion that "we don't propose that you teach religious beliefs, but that you teach *about* them." Nevertheless, even discussion of the advisability of knowing something about other religions than Christianity is a step in the right direction.

A GLANCE AT OTHER RELIGIONS

In response, presumably, to a growing interest in other world religions, *Life* announces the publication of *The World's Great Religions*, "greatly expanded" from its series of the same title. The pre-publication brochure, partisan in tone and subtly suggesting the greater "great-

ness" of Christianity, stresses the eye-appeal of the book, its physical appearance. Under reproductions of beautiful color photographs, we find such come-ons as the following:

> Here through spectacular color photography and eloquent text you'll be able to grasp the subtle and complex teachings of Hinduism —explore the fascinating origins and growth of Buddhism, Asia's most widespread religion.
>
> You'll be introduced to Islam, the religion of chanting muezzins, whirling dervishes, the holy city of Mecca. Here you'll find written the great Philosophies of China, witness celebrations that pay homage to the spirit world.
>
> This book will give you an expanded study of Judaism—one of the great faiths and a major religion in the U.S. . . . Additional sections . . . will document for you each of the six religions. These new essays will excerpt passages from the basic texts which form each belief's very foundation.
>
> Here as the major part of the book ["almost the entire last half"] will be a magnificent testimony to the Christian faith. A treasury of paintings, sensitive color photographs and eloquent essays will express the eternal truths and the glory of Christianity.

Thus, the superficial character of *The World's Great Religions* as a *comparative* study is shown by the fact that all five of the other "great religions" are treated in the first half of the book, and the last given over entirely to a treatment of Christianity.

Lord's Prayer—an Anachronism?

In line with the general broadening of religious concepts, *Newsweek* (Jan. 21) notices that Dr. Wallace P. Rusterholtz, Unitarian and librarian at the University of Chicago, has suggested that "it is high time something was done about the Lord's Prayer, which survives in some Unitarian churches." *Newsweek* continues:

> To begin with, Rusterholtz insists . . . that any appeal to "Our Father" is futile when so many people think of God not as a person but a principle. The phrase "hallowed be Thy name" means, by his interpretation, only to revere God, whereas today man should revere not so much the name but the presence of the spiritual in himself and in all nature.
>
> As a final thrust, he charges that the prayer's conclusion ("for Thine is the kingdom" etc.) "is sonorous and makes an imposing ending, but its significance is merely literary." (The final phrase was indeed added by later scholars to round out the prayer liturgically.)

MEDITATION PREFERABLE TO PRAYER

"Dr. Rusterholtz," says *Newsweek,* "offers his own streamlined version of prayer called 'Meditation' . . . and urges that it, too, be updated at the first signs of inner spiritual fatigue." This version is:

> May we reverence life, within us and in all nature.
> May we strive for the good, and help to realize the ideal.
> May we find each day our proper work.
> May we do unto others as though we were the others.
> May we know good and evil, and overcome evil with good.

THE CHRISTOS PRINCIPLE

Dr. Rusterholtz' remarks about prayer are singularly compatible with what H. P. Blavatsky says on the same subject in the *Key*:

> We call our "Father in heaven" that deific essence of which we are cognizant within us, in our heart and spiritual consciousness, and which has nothing to do with the anthropomorphic conception we may form of it in our physical brain or its fancy. . . . [Prayer is not a petition.] It is a mystery rather; an occult process by which finite and conditioned thoughts and desires, unable to be assimilated by the absolute spirit which is unconditioned, are translated into spiritual wills and the will; such process being called "spiritual transmutation." The intensity of our ardent aspirations changes prayer into the "philosopher's stone," or that which transmutes lead into pure gold. The only homogeneous essence, our "will-prayer" becomes the active or creative force, producing effects according to our desire.

AN AFFIRMATION OF BELIEF

A column in the Portland *Telegram* for Jan. 13, by nationally known columnist Raymond Swing, focusses on a liberal interpretation of "Godhood." Mr. Swing indicates the line of introspection which led to that conclusion, then mentions "belief in a process that is governed by law and is beneficent." He continues:

> Call the process growing into truth. I believe it is what I am here to do. I have become aware that there is an inconceivable wisdom that governs all things right down to me and less than me. Because I can become more and more part of it, I see that I have in me a potential of the All-Wisdom. But I also am aware that my part is infinitesimally minute. Some of my troubles come from not knowing at the right time my own importance as part of the Godhead, and at the right time my own insignificance. . . .
>
> I came to see that what I didn't like in others was also in me, which is how I was able to recognize it. So I could stop trying to change others and go to work on myself. I am the one person I can do something about and am responsible for.

> I also came to see that the love and freedom I want for myself are to be tested by the love and freedom I give others. . . . I believe that happiness and suffering are the two sides of the coin of growth into truth. I believe the process is the tragedy of creation itself. . . .

Mr. Swing's column is a noteworthy example of a non-theosophical approach to the doctrine of Karma. As he says: "In my book, action is the measure of belief."

Scientists Repudiate Dogma

Another break in the rigidity of Church dogma is shown by a poll, reported by the Los Angeles *Times* for March 24:

> A survey conducted for a religious magazine reports that "only one out of five" of the nation's top-ranking scientists believes Jesus Christ rose from the dead.
>
> Wilbur M. Smith, a Pasadena (Calif.) theologian, writing for the magazine *Christianity Today,* said he had received replies from 228 physical and biological scientists listed in "Who's Who in America" to the question whether they believe in the bodily resurrection.
>
> The question was chosen "because of its definiteness," as contrasted to general questions about the immortality of the soul, the deity of Christ and the like, as an index to depth of Christian belief.

Result of Poll

The original list, numbering 544, was first trimmed of the names of those known to be Unitarians, agnostics, or Jews, to assure that only those presumed to be of orthodox persuasion were questioned. Later deletion of names of those who had died or could not be located brought the final list to 521. The *Times* reports:

> To date, Mr. Smith said, he had received 228 replies: 36 affirmations of faith in the Resurrection and 192 nonaffirmations. Of the nonaffirmations, 14 scientists said flatly that they do not believe in the Resurrection, 28 indicated they did not wish to express an opinion, and 23 said they did not know whether Christ rose from the dead.

One cannot resist observing that these last twenty-three scientists have simply aligned themselves with everyone else in Christendom. Belief and knowledge, in orthodoxy, are forever confused.

Literal Interpretation, a Dead End

Mr. Smith feels, says the *Times,* that "the most surprising aspect is the acknowledged lack of faith . . . on the part of scientists who claim membership in some Protestant evangelical denomination."

There is another aspect: Christians, by insisting on a dead-letter interpretation of Christ's life and death, have assumed a position untenable in an "age of reason." Thus, both "scientists" (including all trained in secular logic) and Christians (excluding various liberal denominations) lose by failing to consider that the basis of man's faith may rest on symbolic rather than on literal interpretation of Christ's life, especially the symbology of "resurrection" following "crucifixion," which portrays certain experiences of man's *inner* life. For example:

> The spirit of [crucifixion] has been ever misunderstood. "To crucify before (not against) the sun" is a phrase used of initiation. It comes from Egypt, and primarily from India. The enigma can be unriddled only by searching for its key in the Mysteries of Initiation. The initiated adept, who had successfully passed through all the trials, was *attached,* not *nailed,* but simply tied on a couch in the form of a tau. . . . He was allowed to remain in this state for three days and three nights, during which time his Spiritual Ego was said to confabulate with the "gods," descend into Hades, Amenti, or Patala (according to the country), and do works of charity to the invisible beings, whether souls of men or Elemental Spirits; his body remaining all the time in a temple crypt or subterranean cave . . . and carried during the night of the approaching third day to the entrance of a gallery, where at a certain hour the beams of the rising Sun struck full on the face of the entranced candidate. . . . (*S.D.* II, 558.)

CONTINUING DISCUSSION

Meantime, the discussion of other Church dogmas continues among scholars. The January *Aryan Path* contains Prof. C. D. Broad's comments on Heaven and Hell—a discussion that began with a paper by Prof. H. H. Price in the *Aryan Path* for October, 1955, and which was again commented on by Dr. Robert H. Thouless in the December, 1956, issue. Prof. Broad writes:

> Professor Price rightly insists that we could not properly talk of "survival" unless the supposed unembodied mind be able to remember experiences had by the person in question before his death, and unless it be continuous in character and dispositions with that person's. But he simply assumes without discussion that this is possible. This seems to me extremely hard to believe, for various reasons. I will mention three which strongly influence me:
>
> (1) We know that dissociations of personality occur during the life of a single human body, as a result of injury, illness, shock, etc. Does it seem likely that there would be continuity of personality in

spite of the *prima facie* much more complete chasm between embodiment and complete unenbodiment? (2) Since losses of memory, profound changes of character and emotional disposition, etc., are found to follow certain injuries to the brain and certain diseases, does it not seem almost inevitable to conclude that a person's powers of remembering, character and dispositions are essentially bound up with the body which his mind animates? (3) We can form a fairly satisfactory notion of the basis of persistently organized dispositions in an *extended* substance, for we can think of it in terms of a persistent spatial structure or of types of recurrent motion. But how can we conceive it in a substance which is by hypothesis *without extension?*

Further Considerations

I might remark that there would be no difficulty in combining the view that experiences soon after death resemble dreams rather than waking perceptions, with the view that what persists is a mind animating some kind of body. For, after all, *our* dreams are the experiences of *embodied* minds.

Lastly, I would suggest that it is more plausible to suppose that this dream-like after-death state may occupy the interval between successive embodiments in ordinary bodies, than that it is the prelude to Heaven or to Hell, in the sense in which Professor Price uses those words.

It seems probable that the foregoing items represent an osmosis of scholarly discussion of religious issues into the "race-mind"; so that people in general are more critical of certain Church dogmas, and "even the partisans among contemporary writers on religion" (as *Manas* for Jan. 6, observes), reflect a feeling of obligation to reform theological precepts to suit a philosophical context."

Gods of Ancient Egypt

Lincoln Barnett, writing in *Life* for Nov. 26, 1956, depicts in word and color-photograph the "magnificent legacy of art and architecture which the Egyptians left as a record of their splendid past." His account of the Gods of State, however, shows little comprehension of the subtleties of Egyptian thought hidden in the symbolism of their pantheon—a not infrequent misvaluation which H. P. Blavatsky suggests is owing partly to the veil of secrecy deliberately thrown over the mysteries. Mr. Barnett writes:

For all their preoccupation with eternity, the Egyptians never evolved a coherent system of religious thought. Gods rose and fell in power as political dominance shifted from city to city, their names

changing and identities merging as one deity absorbed the attributes of another. For the Egyptian mentality was such that it could embrace irreconcilable concepts and regard them as complementary rather than opposed.

EGYPTIAN PANTHEON

In the beginning as with other early peoples, the Egyptians saw their gods in nature, in wind and water, in trees and animals, and in the sky. As society coalesced into villages and townships, local deities rose to local dominion. . . . By the time of the pyramid builders, when official religion began, the major gods had become members of a divine family known as the Ennead, or The Nine. According to this cosmogony, the creator Atum rose from the waters of chaos and on a primeval hillock engendered the first two gods, Shu, god of air, and Tefunt, goddess of moisture. They in turn begat Geb, god of earth, and Nut, goddess of the sky. And they in turn begat four offspring, Osiris and his consort Isis, and Seth and his consort Nephtys. . . . Of all the gods, the one who ultimately attained greatest power was Amon-Re.

SYMBOLIC REPRESENTATIONS

Mr. Barnett does not hint—indeed, he seems to have no suspicion of the fact—that these "gods" are personified Forces and Intelligences active in cosmic evolution. Although the following quotation from *The Secret Doctrine* is not in exact parallel to the foregoing, it serves to show the *concept* behind the names of the Egyptian gods:

With the Egyptians, the concealed god was Ammon. All their gods were dual: the scientific *reality* for the Sanctuary; its double, the fabulous and mythical Entity, for the masses. For instance, the older Horus was the *Idea* of the world remaining in the demiurgic mind "born in Darkness before the creation of the world"; the *second* Horus was the same *Idea* going forth from the *Logos,* becoming clothed with matter and assuming an actual existence. The same with *Khnoum* and Ammon; both are represented ram-headed, and both often confused, though their functions are different. Khnoum is "the modeller of men," fashioning men and things out of the Mundane Egg on a potter's wheel; Ammon-Ra, the generator, is the secondary aspect of the concealed deity. Khnoum was adored at Elephanta and Philœ, Ammon at Thebes. But it is Emepht, the One, Supreme *Planetary* principle, who blows the egg out of his mouth, and who is, therefore, Brahmâ. The shadow of the deity, Kosmic and universal, of that which broods over and permeates the egg with its vivifying Spirit until the germ contained in it is ripe, was the *mystery* god whose name was unpronounceable. It is Phtah, however, "he who opens," the opener

of life and Death, who proceeds from the egg of the world to begin his dual work. (*S.D.* I, 366-7.)

"Monotheistic Heresy"

Although H.P.B. states in *Isis* (I, 23) that "despite their apparent Polytheism, the ancients—those of the educated class at all events—were entirely monotheistical; and this, too, ages upon ages before the days of Moses," Mr. Barnett dates Egyptian monotheism from Akh-en-Aton's accession to the throne in 1261 B.C.:

> Early in his reign he revolted from the ancient polytheism and conceived the heretical idea that only one god, one true god, reigned over all men everywhere. In this avowal, he ran headlong into the entrenched priesthoods of Egypt's multifarious gods, and in particular into the apostles of Amon, the imperial god of Thebes. Defying centuries of tradition, the young pharaoh asserted that there was the one god and that his name was Aton.
>
> Barely a century earlier there had been no such god. The word *aton* simply connoted the visible disk of the sun . . . He simply identified Aton as the source of life in the universe, creator and benefactor, dispenser of light and joy and love, not only to Egypt but the entire world. . . . Not content with proclaiming Aton as the one true god, Akh-en-Aton demanded repudiation of the older deities. . . .

Egyptian Influence on Moses

> Through the years scholars have wondered what effect Akh-en-Aton's monotheism might have exerted on Moses, who according to one theory led the Exodus from Egypt in the century after the pharaoh's death. . . . Although there is no evidence of any direct connection between Akh-en-Aton's monotheism and that of Moses, the Hebrews were unquestionably influenced by Egyptian literature, thought and custom.

According to H. P. Blavatsky, Moses was not merely "influenced" by the Egyptians—he was actually learned in their mysteries:

> Moses is mentioned by several old historians as an Egyptian priest; Manetho says he was a hierophant of Hieropolis, and a priest of the sun-god Osiris, and that his name was Osarsiph. Those moderns, who accept it as a fact that he "was learned in *all* the wisdom" of the Egyptians, must also submit to the right interpretation of the word wisdom, which was throughout the world known as a synonym of *initiation* into the secret mysteries of the *Magi.* Did the idea never strike the reader of the *Bible,* that an alien, born and brought up in a foreign country *could not* and *would not* possibly have been admitted —we will not say to the final initiation, the grandest mystery of all, but

> even to share the knowledge of the minor priesthood, those who belonged to the *lesser* mysteries? . . . Moses, if not an Egyptian by birth, became one through being admitted into the priesthood. (*Isis* I, 555-6.)

Such passages show how difficult it is to evaluate the religions of antiquity without some guide to symbolic meanings.

"STRANGE AS IT SEEMS"

In the comic section of the Independent *Star-News* (Pasadena), under this title, we find:

> The apex of the great pyramid is the center of the earth's land surface. Two lines drawn through its tip and circling the earth from north to south and east to west divide the world into four sections, each containing the *same amount of land.* Each line traverses more land than can any other similar line on the earth's surface.
>
> How did the ancient Egyptians, who erected this pyramid thousands of years ago when the rest of the world was supposedly unknown to them, happen to select such a definite spot? Was it a science unknown today? Was it a mere coincidence?

The Secret Doctrine answers:

> They had [knowledge]; and it is on this "knowledge" that the programme of the MYSTERIES and of the series of Initiations was based: thence, the construction of the Pyramids, the everlasting record and the indestructible symbol of these Mysteries and Initiations on Earth, as the courses of the stars are in Heaven (I, 314).

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS WARNED

Pope Pius XII warned his people in his Christmas Message (New York *Times,* Dec. 24, 1956) that the Church would not support conscientious objectors in event of a defensive war. The *Times* quotes:

> If a body representative of the people and a government—both having been chosen by free elections—in a moment of extreme danger decide, by legitimate instruments of internal and external policy, on defensive precautions, and carry out the plans which they consider necessary, they do not act immorally; so that a Catholic citizen cannot invoke his own conscience in order to refuse to serve and fulfill those duties the law imposes. On this matter we feel that we are in perfect harmony with our predecessors.

This is clearly one of those instances where the dictum of the Church substitutes for the individual conscience.

Erratum.—In April Lookout, page 281, line 6 of complete quotation, read electro-magnetics for electro-gravitics.

THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS

DECLARATION

The policy of this Lodge is independent devotion to the cause of Theosophy, without professing attachment to any Theosophical organization. It is loyal to the great Founders of the Theosophical Movement, but does not concern itself with dissensions or differences of individual opinion.

The work it has on hand and the end it keeps in view are too absorbing and too lofty to leave it the time or inclination to take part in side issues. That work and that end is the dissemination of the Fundamental Principles of the philosophy of Theosophy, and the exemplification in practice of those principles, through a truer realization of the SELF; a profounder conviction of Universal Brotherhood.

It holds that the unassailable basis for union among Theosophists, wherever and however situated, is "similarity of aim, purpose and teaching," and therefore has neither Constitution, By-Laws nor Officers, the sole bond between its Associates being that basis. And it aims to disseminate this idea among Theosophists in the furtherance of Unity.

It regards as Theosophists all who are engaged in the true service of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, condition or organization, and

It welcomes to its association all those who are in accord with its declared purposes and who desire to fit themselves, by study and otherwise, to be the better able to help and teach others.

"The true Theosophist belongs to no cult or sect; yet belongs to each and all."

Being in sympathy with the purposes of this Lodge, as set forth in its "Declaration," I hereby record my desire to be enrolled as an Associate, it being understood that such association calls for no obligation on my part, other than that which I, myself, determine.

The foregoing is the form signed by Associates of the United Lodge of Theosophists. Inquiries are invited from all persons to whom this Movement may appeal. Cards for signatures will be sent upon request, and every possible assistance furnished Associates in their studies and in efforts to form local Lodges. There are no fees of any kind, and no formalities to be complied with. Write to:

GENERAL REGISTRAR, UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS,
Theosophy Hall, 33rd and Grand Ave., Los Angeles 7, Calif.

U. L. T. LODGES

AMSTERDAM, Z. HOLLAND ..... 123 Stadionweg
BANGALORE CITY, INDIA ..... 15 Sir Krishna Rao Rd., Basavangudi
BERCHEM, ANTWERP, BELGIUM ..... 62 Transvaal Straat
BERKELEY 4, CALIFORNIA ..... Masonic Temple Bldg., Bancroft and Shattuck
BOMBAY 1, INDIA ..... 51 Mahatma Gandhi Road
LAGUNA BEACH, CALIFORNIA ..... 1175 South Coast Boulevard
LEIDEN, HOLLAND ..... Roodenburgerstraat 35
LONDON W. 2, ENGLAND ..... Robert Crosbie House, 62 Queen's Gardens
LONDON, ONTARIO, CANADA ..... 524 William Street
LOS ANGELES 7, CALIFORNIA ..... 245 West 33rd Street
MATUNGA, BOMBAY 19, INDIA ..... Anandi Nivas, Bhaudaji Road
NEW YORK 21, NEW YORK ..... 347 East 72nd Street
PARIS 16, FRANCE ..... 11 bis rue Keppler
PHILADELPHIA 3, PENNSYLVANIA ..... 1917 Walnut Street
PHOENIX, ARIZONA ..... 32 North Central Avenue
READING, PENNSYLVANIA ..... 812 North Fifth Street
SACRAMENTO 14, CALIFORNIA ..... 1237½ H Street
SAN DIEGO 3, CALIFORNIA ..... 3148 Fifth Avenue
SAN FRANCISCO 14, CALIFORNIA ..... 166 Sanchez Street
SAN LEANDRO, CALIFORNIA ..... 579 Foothill Boulevard
SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA ..... Federation House, 166 Phillip Street
WASHINGTON 9, D. C. ..... 1722 Connecticut Ave., N.W.

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLICATIONS

Books by H. P. Blavatsky:

Isis Unveiled, a photographic facsimile of the Original Edition, the two volumes bound in one	$ 7.50
The Secret Doctrine, facsimile edition, two volumes in one	8.50
Index to the Secret Doctrine, for students	3.00
The Secret Doctrine *and* Index	11.00
The Key to Theosophy, facsimile of Original Edition	3.00
Theosophical Glossary, facsimile of Original Edition	5.00
Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge	2.50
The Voice of the Silence	1.50

Books by William Q. Judge:

The Ocean of Theosophy	2.00
Letters That Have Helped Me, new and enlarged edition	3.00
The Bhagavad-Gita	1.50
Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita	2.50
Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms	1.50
The Heart Doctrine, selections from Wm. Q. Judge	2.00
Vernal Blooms, selected articles from W.Q.J	2.00

Other Books:

The Friendly Philosopher, Letters and Talks by Robert Crosbie	3.00
Answers to Questions on the "Ocean," by Robert Crosbie	2.00
The Eternal Verities, for children, new edition	2.00
Teacher's Manual and Guide to the "Eternal Verities"	2.50
"Because—" for the Children Who Ask Why	2.00
Light on the Path, written down by "M.C." (Bombay Ed.)	.75
Through the Gates of Gold, written down by "M.C."	1.50
Occult Tales, by H. P. Blavatsky and Wm. Q. Judge	2.00
From the Book of Images, a volume of Indian tales	3.00
The Theosophical Movement, 1875-1950	5.00
Selections from the Upanishads, and the Tao Te King	2.00
The Dhammapada	2.00

Pamphlets:

Theosophy Simply Stated (10 copies, 50 cents; 50 copies, $2.00)	.10
Conversations on Theosophy, including the "Three Fundamentals"	.10
Reincarnation and Karma, the "Aphorisms," by Wm. Q. Judge	.10
Thoughts for Thinkers, a helpful essay	.10
What is Death?	.10
The Vocation of Life	.10
The United Lodge of Theosophists, its history, purpose, and methods	.25
Five Messages to American Theosophists, by H. P. Blavatsky	.25
Epitome of Theosophy, by William Q. Judge	.25
Echoes from the Orient, by William Q. Judge	.50
Moral Education, new and enlarged edition	.50
A Christian and a Theosophist	.25
The Laws of Healing, Physical and Metaphysical	.50
States After Death, and Spiritualistic "Communications" Explained	.35
Cycles of Psychism, The Import of Psychic Evolution	.50
Hypnotism—A Psychic Malpractice	.25
What is Theosophy? A collation from H. P. Blavatsky	.25

Prices subject to change without notice. Order from

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles 7, California
347 East 72nd Street, New York 21, New York